



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/224,211	12/30/1998	JACK WASSOM	06975/033001	3985

26171 7590 03/12/2003

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
1425 K STREET, N.W.
11TH FLOOR
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3500

EXAMINER

HUYNH, BA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2173

DATE MAILED: 03/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/224,221

Applicant(s)

DOLEH ET AL.

Examiner

Ba Huynh

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 December 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-19,24-30,32-47 and 52-78 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-19,24-30,32-47 and 52-78 is/are rejected.

- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. Claims 1, 2, 4-19, 24-30, 32-47, 52-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US patent #5,966,533 (Moody), in view of US patent #5,956,029 (Okada et al).

- As for claims 1, 28, 29: Moody teaches a computer implemented method and corresponding system for regulating user interface control (1:62-66), comprising the steps/means for:

accessing a maturity level (age group, 1:67) for the user in a database based on a user identity (7:2-35; figure 6),
automatically associating a grouping with the user identity by selecting a grouping from among a plurality of groupings based on the maturity level for the user (1:67 – 2:4; 3:54-63; 7:46-51),
automatically providing a set of user interface controls corresponding to the identified grouping (2:6-23; figures 3-5).

Moody fails to clearly teach the receiving a user identity for the user. However it appears that the receiving user identity step is implicitly included in order for the system to generate different interface for different user age group (see 7:46-52). Even if it is not implementation of receiving user identity is well known in the art of access control and log-in procedure. It would have been obvious to one of skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine

the well known method of receiving user identity to Moody. Motivation of the combining is for identifying the user characteristic for the conversion.

Moody fails to clearly teach that the set including a toolbar. However, in the same field of user interface conversion, Okada et al teach the implementation of customizable user interface elements, including a toolbar (4:55-56; 10:12-20; e.g., the print, view, search, and navigation icons in figures 16, 23-26) based on user age (2:26-30). It would have been obvious to one of skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to implement the Okada's teaching of the customizable toolbar to Moody. Motivation of the implementation is for the advantage of having predefined functions represented in the toolbar.

- As for claims 2, 30: The toolbar is a bank of user interface controls.
- As for claims 4, 32: Okada's customizable user interface elements further include buttons (4:56).
- As for claims 5, 33: Okada's customizable user interface elements further include pull-down menu (9:27).
- As for claims 6, 8, 9, 34, 36, 37: Per Okada, existing user interface controls can be replaced by new user interface controls (figures 12-26).
- As for claims 7, 35: Per Okada, new interface elements can be added to the customized user interface (10:21-26; figures 17, 18, 26, 27).
- As for claims 10, 38: The combined teachings fail to clearly teach the adding/removing of menu options to a pull-down menu. However, Official notice is taken that implementation of adding/removing of menu options in a pull-down menu

is well known in the art. Example of such implementation is for customizing the menu according to user level of skill or familiarity with an application interface. It would have been obvious to one of skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the well known implementation of adding/removing menu options in a pull-down menu to Moody&Okada. Motivation of the combine is for providing a user interface appropriate to the skill level of the user.

- As for claims 11, 39: Per Moody, the grouping is based on the user level of maturity (7:46-52).
- As for claims 12, 40: Per Moody, the grouping includes a kids grouping (7:46-52).
- As for claims 13, 41: Okada teaches the implementation of user interface conversion for teenager users (10:21-26). Implementation of a teenagers grouping to Moody's grouping of user would have been obvious in light of Moody's teaching of grouping based on age.
- As for claims 14, 26, 42, 54: The combined teachings fail to clearly teach the grouping corresponding to access level. However implementation of grouping corresponding to access level would have been obvious in light of Moody's teaching of user category (7:2-2-).
- As for claims 15-17, 43-45: Per Moody, the interface can be implemented in Network and Internet (5:45-47). Implementation of Email, network browsing, chat applications are inherently included in Moody's teaching of Internet. Even if it is not, it would have been obvious to one of skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the well known Internet Email, network browsing, chat

applications to Moody. Motivation of the combining is for information exchanging and retrieving.

- As for claims 18, 46: The steps/means for receiving a user identity for the user is implicitly included in Moody in order for the system to generate different interface for different user age group (see 7:46-52).
- As for claims 19, 47: the combined teaching fails to clearly teach receiving user identity via network connection. However Official notice is taken that implementation of receiving user identity via network connection is well known in networking application, such as login procedure for access control. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the well known implementation of receiving user identity via network connection to Moody et al. Motivation of the combining is to verify the user ID and obtaining user context data for appropriate user interface customization.
- As for claims 24, 52: the grouping includes grouping based on user characteristics (3:54-58).
- As for claims 25, 53, 56, 57: The user characteristics comprise age (3:58-59).
- As for claim 55: Information describing the set of controls is exchanged between the network connected atom server and atom client (figure 2).
- As for claims 58-60: Implementation of access control as defined by a master user such as parent, teacher, or network administrator is well known and would have been obvious to one of skill in the art.

Art Unit: 2173

1. Claims 61-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US patent #5,966,533 (Moody).

- As for claims 61, 71, 75: Moody teaches a computer implemented method and corresponding system for regulating user interface control (1:62-66), comprising the steps/means for:
 - accessing a maturity level (age group, 1:67) for the user in a database based on a user identity (7:2-35; figure 6),
 - automatically associating a grouping with the user identity by selecting a grouping from among a plurality of groupings based on the maturity level for the user (1:67 – 2:4; 3:54-63; 7:46-51),
 - automatically providing a set of user interface controls corresponding to the identified grouping (2:6-23; figures 3-5).

Moody fails to clearly teach the receiving a user identity for the user. However it appears that the receiving user identity step is implicitly included in order for the system to generate different interface for different user age group (see 7:46-52). Even if it is not implementation of receiving user identity is well known in the art of access control and log-in procedure. It would have been obvious to one of skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the well known method of receiving user identity to Moody. Motivation of the combining is for identifying the user characteristic for the conversion.

- As for claims 62, 72, 76: Per Moody, the grouping is based on the user level of maturity (7:46-52).

Art Unit: 2173

- As for claim 63: Per Moody, the grouping includes a kids grouping (7:46-52).
- As for claim 64: Implementation of a teenagers grouping to Moody's grouping of user would have been obvious in light of Moody's teaching of grouping based on age.
- As for claims 65, 69, 73, 77: Moody fails to clearly teach the grouping corresponding to access level. However implementation of grouping corresponding to access level would have been obvious in light of Moody's teaching of user category (7:2-2-).
- As for claims 66-68: Per Moody, the interface can be implemented in Network and Internet (5:45-47). Implementation of Email, network browsing, chat applications are inherently included in Moody's teaching of Internet. Even if it is not, it would have been obvious to one of skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to combine the well known Internet Email, network browsing, chat applications to Moody.
Motivation of the combining is for information exchanging and retrieving.
- As for claims 70, 74, 78: The user characteristics comprise age (3:58-59).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2173

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Inquires

Note: This application had been reassigned to Examiner Ba Huynh.

Art Unit: 2173

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ba Huynh whose telephone number is (703) 305-9794. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cabeca John can be reached on (703) 308-3116. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7238 for regular communications and (703) 746-7239 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800.

Ba Huynh
Primary Examiner
AU 2173
March 8, 2003

BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER

